MERCOLA
Take Control of Your Health

Pfizer Seeks COVID Shot Authorization for Children Under 5

Analysis by Dr. Joseph Mercola ✔ Fact Checked

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- February 1, 2022, Pfizer/BioNTech asked the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to grant emergency use authorization (EUA) for their COVID shot to babies and children aged 6 months through 4 years
- The EUA will be for a two-dose regimen, with the possibility of extending it to a third dose, as two injections have been shown to be ineffective in 2- to 4-year-olds
- Children aged 6 months to 4 years will get a dose that is one-tenth the adult dose
- Were Pfizer to wait until the triple-dose experiment is completed, the EUA request would not be possible until late March 2022, and federal officials are reportedly "anxious to begin a vaccination program for the youngest children because the studies showed there were no safety concerns with two doses"
- Meanwhile, Pfizer's own data raise massive safety concerns, as they received 42,086 injury reports, including 1,223 fatalities in the first 2.5 months of their COVID jab rollout for adults

I'm sure you're aware of the massive catastrophe we have with children under 5 dropping ill like flies from COVID, as this is the justification Pfizer is using to get an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) so they can jab these defenseless and innocent children. No? Me, neither.

Despite conclusive evidence that young children have virtually no risk of severe complications or death from COVID-19, Pfizer is hustling to get our infants and toddlers injected with their experimental gene transfer technology.

February 1, 2022, Pfizer/BioNTech asked the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to grant emergency use authorization (EUA) for their COVID shot to babies and children aged 6 months through 4 years.[1,2,3]

In mid-December 2021, Pfizer admitted that two injections, at one-tenth the adult dose, failed to produce an adequate immune response in 2- to 4-year-olds. They're now experimenting to see if three doses will produce adequate results in that age group. In the meantime, the EUA will be for a two-dose regimen, with the possibility of extending it to a third dose.

As reported by The New York Times,[4] were Pfizer to wait until the triple-dose experiment is completed, the EUA request would not be possible until late March 2022, and federal officials are reportedly "anxious to begin a vaccination program for the youngest children because the studies showed there were no safety concerns with two doses."

In other words, they apparently don't care whether the shots are effective or not. They claim the shots are "safe," so it's OK to inject young children even though they might not gain any benefit. Does that make any sense?

> **"A number of medical experts, scientists and published studies have warned the COVID shots can reprogram your immune system to respond in a dysfunctional manner. Is it really wise to expose babies and toddlers to such risks?"**

According to MSN:[5]

> *"[Pfizer] and its partner BioNTech said that the submission was at the request of the FDA, which is an unusual move. Quickly after the announcement, the FDA*

scheduled a meeting of its vaccine advisory committee for Feb. 15 to discuss the application.

Allowing Pfizer to submit the request now means that, if authorized, 'parents will have the opportunity to begin a COVID-19 vaccination series for their children while awaiting potential authorization of a third dose,' according to Pfizer CEO Albert Bourla. Data on the third dose will be submitted to the FDA 'in the coming months,' the company said."

COVID Shots Shown to Destroy Immune Function

The list of concerns is a long one. We've already seen that Pfizer's own data reveal there are serious problems with the shots, and real-world data confirming worst fears are mounting by the day.

A number of medical experts, scientists and published studies have warned the COVID shots can reprogram your immune system to respond in a dysfunctional manner. For example, a study[6] posted on the preprint server medRxiv, May 6, 2021, found the Pfizer/BioNTech COVID jab "reprograms both adaptive and innate immune responses," causing immune depletion.

While the jab "induced effective humoral and cellular immunity against several SARS-CoV-2 variants," the shot "also modulated the production of inflammatory cytokines by innate immune cells upon stimulation with both specific (SARS-CoV-2) and nonspecific (viral, fungal and bacterial) stimuli."

People who were "fully vaccinated," having received two doses of the Pfizer shot, also produced significantly less interferon upon stimulation, which hampers vitally important innate immune responses.

In other words, we're looking at a horrible tradeoff. You may get some protection against SARS-CoV-2 and its variants, but you're weakening your overall immune function, which opens the door wide to all sorts of other health problems, from bacterial, fungal and viral infections to cancer and autoimmunity.

Is it really wise to expose babies and toddlers to such risks? Just because children aren't dying within a few weeks of the shot does not mean it's harmless and therefore safe to use. Most of the damage from these jabs will emerge far down the road, long after they've gotten the shot.

The FDA is really behaving in an irresponsible and negligent manner, putting every child in America in harm's way in the longer term — and for no reason at all, since they know very well two doses won't work in 2- to 4-year-olds, and they have no idea if three doses will do the trick.

Pfizer Data Strengthen Safety Concerns

Pfizer's own trial data,[7] which are starting to be released in response to a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request to the FDA, also do nothing to assuage safety concerns. Quite the contrary. Cumulatively, between December 1, 2020, and February 28, 2021 — a period of just 2.5 months — Pfizer received 42,086 injury reports, including 1,223 fatalities.

Compare that to the 1976 swine flu vaccine, which was pulled after 25 deaths. Pfizer even acknowledges the abnormal rate of injuries. They actually had to hire more data entry and case processing personnel to handle the influx of adverse events reports. Still, they insist everything is hunky-dory and there's absolutely no problem.

Initially, the FDA wanted 55 years to release all of Pfizer's trial data at a rate of 500 pages per month. After finding another trove of related documents, they asked for 75 years. A judge denied both requests, ordering the agency to release the data at a rate of 55,000 pages per month, starting March 1, 2022, to finalize the full release in about eight months.[8]

Judging by what we found in the initial 500-page batch released in November 2021, it's no wonder the FDA wanted enough time to make sure all culpable parties would be dead and buried before the full truth of their malfeasance came out. If all goes well, we should have all that evidence by September 2022.

Pfizer Intervenes in FOIA Lawsuit

There's yet another wrinkle in the FOIA lawsuit against the FDA, though. Pfizer is now pushing to intervene in the case. Pfizer says it wants to "help" the FDA with the redaction of the documentation, claiming it contains trade secrets and proprietary information that need to be protected and might be inappropriately disclosed if rushed.[9,10] January 26, 2022, Reuters reported:[11]

> *"Pfizer Inc. wants to intervene in a Texas federal lawsuit seeking information from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration used in licensing the company's COVID-19 vaccine, a litigation move that plaintiffs who are suing for the data say is premature.*
>
> *Pfizer's lawyers at DLA Piper told U.S. District Judge Mark Pittman on Jan. 21 it wanted a role in the proceedings to help the FDA avoid 'inappropriately' disclosing trade secret and confidential commercial information ...*
>
> *The group of doctors and scientists who sued last year over public access to the FDA's Pfizer licensing records said in a court **filing** that the company's bid to jump into the lawsuit was untimely because the plaintiffs have not challenged any redactions to requested records."*

The Defender further reported:[12]

> *"The FDA claimed Pfizer is entitled to intervene in the case and the process of redacting the documents in question, due to the "Trade Secrets Act," signed into law by President Obama in 2016, stating:*
>
> *'FDA anticipates that coordination with Pfizer to obtain the company's views as to which portions of the records are subject to Exemption 4, the Trade Secrets Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1905, or other statutory protections will be a necessary component of the agency's endeavors to meet the extraordinary exigencies of this case.'*

However, according to The Gateway Pundit, the Trade Secrets Act is being misinterpreted by the FDA and Pfizer: '[T]he protections provided under that law allow for an owner of a trade secret to sue in federal court when its trade secrets have been misappropriated and does not even imply that a company could intervene in a public records request through the FOIA.'

[Aaron] Siri [of the Siri & Glimstad law firm] also questioned the FDA's commitment to transparency and hinted at a cover-up, stating: 'The Court is, other than Congress, the only check on the FDA ...

It is understandable that the FDA does not want independent scientists to review the documents it relied upon to license Pfizer's vaccine given that it is not as effective as the FDA originally claimed, does not prevent transmission, does not prevent against certain emerging variants, can cause serious heart inflammation in younger individuals, and has numerous other undisputed safety issues.'

Siri said the FDA's 'potential embarrassment' over its decision to license the Pfizer vaccine must take a back seat to the transparency demanded by FOIA and 'the urgent need and interests of the American people to review that licensure data.'"

'The Truth About Pfizer'

The British "Dispatches" documentary above, "Vaccine Wars: The Truth About Pfizer," reviews a number of issues relating to Pfizer's handling of the COVID pandemic, including its "war profiteering" (focusing on profits during a pandemic) and spreading misleading claims about its competitors, a whistleblower's claims of scientific misconduct, and questions about Pfizer "playing God" by unilaterally dictating who would get its jab and who wouldn't, thereby prolonging the pandemic.

According to the Dispatches report, Pfizer's jab was not only more expensive than its rival AstraZeneca to begin with, costing the U.K. government £18 per dose compared to

£3 for AstraZeneca, but as a third booster dose rolled out, Pfizer raised its price to £22, a decision that has raised questions about the company's motives. It seems fairly obvious that it's all about the money for them.

Pfizer will, of course, disagree with that obvious conclusion. According to professor Sir Andrew Pollard, who helped develop the Pfizer shot, the company's incentive was never about maximizing profits. U.S. Congresswoman Jan Schakowsky, on the other hand, told Dispatches that Pfizer clearly made no effort to rein in their pricing or limit their profits.

Unprecedented Profiteering

According to Dispatches, Pfizer's COVID jab has become the most profitable pharmaceutical product the world has ever seen. As of the third quarter of 2021, Pfizer's revenues were 130% above operational costs, with COVID jab revenue for 2021 reaching $36 billion. Revenue from the jab is predicted to rise to $55 billion in 2022 — equivalent to the gross domestic product (GDP) of Croatia.

One of the reasons for Pfizer's record-breaking profits, Dispatches says, is because it has been prioritizing sales to wealthier Western nations willing and able to pay the higher cost. Pfizer has also refused to license its patented recipe to ensure an adequate supply for poorer nations.

Its gross profit margin is estimated to be somewhere around 80%, or perhaps a little more. Pfizer, meanwhile, claims its profit margin for the jab is in the high-20%. Pfizer defends its profiteering, in part, by saying it pays for needed research and development, but let's remember that taxpayers paid for all of the research and development that went into this jab in the first place.

As explained in the video, the initial development of the Pfizer jab was done by BioNTech, which received millions of euros of public funding from both the German government and the European Union. Essentially, the public paid for its development and then got fleeced while Pfizer makes out like a bandit.

By the end of 2021, Pfizer had manufactured 2 billion doses of the jab. But while the company claims it's dedicated to provide "equitable and affordable access," only 16% had gone to lower- and middle-income countries, and only 1% to the poorest of nations.

In 2022, Pfizer intends to produce 4 billion doses. According to Dispatches, the total cost of manufacturing is somewhere between 80 cents and $1.40 per dose. The most likely cost is right around $1.05. Pfizer disputes this, saying it "does not reflect the true costs" of making the jab, as this cost does not include the cost of scaling up manufacturing efforts, global distribution and clinical trials.

The U.K., which pays the highest price for Pfizer's jab, had at the end of 2021 paid Pfizer an estimated £2.6 billion (about $3.5 billion) which, based on the cost of production, is thought to be about £2 billion (around $2.7 billion) more than it should have paid, had the profit margin been more reasonable.

Pfizer Spread Misinformation About Rivals

According to Dispatches, Pfizer is also responsible for spreading misinformation about rival COVID shots, including the AstraZeneca injection. A Canadian PowerPoint presentation sent to medical professionals included a slide detailing alleged disadvantages of viral vector DNA injections (such as the AstraZeneca shot).

The slide states that viral vector DNA injections might cause chromosomal integration and oncogenesis. In other words, the DNA might become permanently integrated in your genes, and could cause cancer. There was also a warning against its use in immunocompromised patients.

Curiously enough, when asked, Pollard claims there's no truth to any of those claims. So, "how did those claims come to be shown to health professionals across Canada?" Dispatches asks. After some digging, they discovered the presentation was, in part, funded by Pfizer, and that the key speaker who gave the presentation had received Pfizer funding.

More specifically, the portion of the presentation that listed disadvantages of viral vector DNA products was written by a team that included at least one member who had previously worked in Pfizer's vaccine department.

When asked about the risks associated with vaccine misinformation, Pollard says there are "huge risks," as anything that causes people to be hesitant about getting the shot can result in them risking their lives.

So, seeing how Pfizer appears to have undermined a competing COVID jab, aren't they then guilty of causing vaccine hesitancy and putting lives at risk? And, seeing how Pollard claims there's no truth to any of those warnings, doesn't that suggest Pfizer put people's lives at risk for no other reason than to maximize their own profits? Pfizer, of course, denies having had any influence over the creation of the presentation.

Keep in mind, I strongly disagree with Dispatches' claims that the Pfizer shot is a life-saving drug. I also disagree with Pollard's claim that vaccine hesitancy is potentially life-threatening. What I'm pointing out here is the hypocrisy.

While Dispatches valiantly tries to paint Pfizer as a global savior, albeit a greedy one, I believe all COVID jabs are a dangerous scam that are doing far more harm to humanity than good. They're literally raking in unprecedented profits from the suffering and death of untold millions.

Were Corners Cut?

After giving the audience a blanket assurance that the Pfizer jab is "clearly safe and effective," Dispatches goes on to review whistleblower testimony[13] from Brooke Jackson, a clinical research coordinator and former regional director of Ventavia Research Group, a research organization charged with testing Pfizer's COVID jab at several sites in Texas.

Jackson, who worked on Pfizer's Phase 3 COVID jab trial in the fall of 2020, claims she found evidence of trial data being falsified. She was also shocked to realize that patients in the clinical trials were unblinded.

Their charts contained information showing whether they got the real shot or a placebo, which is a serious breach. "In all the time I've been doing research, I've never seen the type of misconduct that I saw [at Ventavia]," Jackson says.

She repeatedly informed her superiors about concerns over poor laboratory management, patient safety and data integrity issues — all of which were ignored. She also tried to get in touch with the Pfizer site liaison, but was never able to speak to him directly. Eventually, she filed a complaint with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, and that too was ignored. To top it off, she was fired.

In response to Dispatches inquiries, Pfizer claims they conducted "a thorough investigation" into Jackson's claims, that "actions were taken to correct and remediate" the problems she'd reported, and that no evidence was found that would "invalidate the data or jeopardize the integrity of the study." Ventavia also claims they found Jackson's accusations to be "unsubstantiated," and the FDA insists it has "full confidence" in Pfizer's data.

Why Are We Experimenting on Children?

Historically, children have been excluded from early human trials, and for good reason. The possibility of harm is great no matter what the drug, and here we're talking about a never-before-used gene transfer technology that hasn't even been tested on animals.

Worse yet, hundreds of thousands of American adults have experienced very serious and debilitating side effects. More than 10,300 have died post-jab, as of January 21, 2022, in the U.S. territories alone.[14] Why is the FDA risking our children?

As mentioned, we already know children are essentially at zero risk of dying from COVID. They might test positive. They might develop symptoms, but they get through it just like they get through the common cold or flu. There's no reason to jeopardize their long-term health with a COVID jab. They don't need it, and therefore ANY risk of the jab, no matter how small, is unconscionable and unacceptable.

Fortunately, many parents, including many who got the shot themselves, are not willing to gamble their young ones. By mid-December 2021, just under 20% of children between the ages of 5 and 11 in the U.S. had received their first COVID shot, with vaccination rates among urban children being twice that of those living in rural areas.[15]

However, since then, the injection rate has rapidly dropped off. In Florida, the weekly injection rate among children 5 to 11 was 55,548 in mid-November 2021, when the EUA for this age group went into effect. By the last week of January 2022, that weekly rate had dwindled to 10,084.[16] I would sincerely hope that as the EUA is extended all the way down to 6-month-olds, parents simply refuse their children's participation in this ongoing experiment.

Sources and References

- [1, 4] New York Times January 31, 2022 (Archived)
- [2, 5] MSN February 1, 2022
- [3, 16] Yahoo! News February 1, 2022
- [6] medRxiv May 6, 2021
- [7] PHMPT.org Pfizer documents
- [8] Denver Gazette January 7, 2022
- [9] Endpoint News January 27, 2022
- [10, 12] The Defender January 31, 2022
- [11] Reuters January 26, 2022
- [13] The BMJ 2021; 375:n2635
- [14] OpenVAERS US/Territories data as of January 21, 2022
- [15] NBC News December 15, 2021